

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On April 34, 2007, a telephone Interview was held between Patent Examiners Daniel J. Mills and Daniel P. Stodola, and David L. Fox, attorney for applicants.

The pending rejections of the Office Action of January 25, 2007, were discussed, as well as possible amendments to the claims in order to overcome the rejections. More specifically, at the Interview the following issues were discussed: (1) Claim 13 was confirmed to be a product-by-process claim; (2) Claims 12 and 19, rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement, were indicated by applicants' attorney to be canceled without prejudice or acquiescence, but simply in the interest of advancing the application to allowance; (3) Claims 2-7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 24 were discussed, as well as amendments to the claims in relation to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention; (4) Claims 21, 21, 23 and 24 were discussed, as well as amendments to the claims in relation to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Sweeney (US Pat. No. 823,451), with applicant's attorney pointing out that Sweeney does not teach or disclose at least the claim limitation that the non-tab portion of the end of the member is shaped such that when the tab is engaged in the tab slot, the entire non-tab surface area of the member fits flush against the internal surface diameter of the stabilizing surface; (5) Claim 22 was discussed, as well as amendments to the claim in relation to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Sweeney in view of Shaw (US Pat. No. 6,406,003), with applicant's attorney pointing out that Sweeney, the primary reference does not teach or disclose at least the claim limitation that the non-tab portion of the end of the member is shaped such that when the tab is engaged in the tab slot, the entire non-tab surface area of the member fits flush against the internal surface diameter of the stabilizing surface, and Shaw fails to teach or suggest this limitation as well; (6) Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10, 12-15 and 17-19 were discussed, as well as amendments to the claims in relation to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over "applicants' admitted prior art" in view of Querengesser (US Pat. No. 3,021,116) and Sweeney, with

applicant's attorney pointing out that Sweeney, the primary reference does not teach or disclose at least the claim limitation that the non-tab portion of the end of the member is shaped such that when the tab is engaged in the tab slot, the entire non-tab surface area of the member fits flush against the internal surface diameter of the stabilizing surface, and that the additional cited prior art fails to teach or suggest this limitation as well; and (7) Claims 3 and 16 were discussed, as well as amendments to the claims in relation to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over "applicants' admitted prior art" in view of Querengesser (US Pat. No. 3,021,116) and Sweeney and further in view of Shaw, with applicant's attorney pointing out that Sweeney, the primary reference does not teach or disclose at least the claim limitation that the non-tab portion of the end of the member is shaped such that when the tab is engaged in the tab slot, the entire non-tab surface area of the member fits flush against the internal surface diameter of the stabilizing surface, and that the additional cited prior art fails to teach or suggest this limitation as well.

No exhibits or demonstrations were conducted.

Agreement was not reached.